REMARKS

Claims 28, 32-33, 55 and 58-64 are pending. Claims 36, 40-41, 44, 48-49, 52-54 has been cancelled without prejudice, while claims 1-27, 29-31, 34-35, 37-39, 42-43, 45-47 and 50-51 were previously cancelled without prejudice. Claims 28, 55 and 58 have been amended and new claims 61-64 have been added. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments and new claims are fully supported by the originally filed application and that no new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 28, 32-33, 36, 40-41, 44, 48-49, and 52-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takasaki et al. (US 2003/0140261) (hereinafter "Takasaki") in view of Crouch et al. (US 6,970,080) (hereinafter "Crouch") and further in view of Kouropoulos et al. (US 6,961,856) (hereinafter "Kouropoulos"). In the rejection, the Examiner indicated that Takasaki discloses a method comprising providing an operating voltage to a processor and modifying the operating voltage provided to the processor based on a mode of operation of the processor, but fails to specifically disclose the processor being configured to process wireless signals and sensing a level of power supplied to the processor in order to determine a current mode of operation. The Examiner also indicated that Crouch teaches a processor configured to process wireless signals and that Kouropoulos teaches sensing a level of power supplied to a device in order to determine the current mode of operation. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 28 is directed to a method comprising providing an operating voltage to a processor configured to process wireless communication signals, determining an anticipated change in a mode of operation of the processor, and modifying the operating voltage provided to the processor based on the anticipated change in the mode of operation of the processor.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references disclose changing a mode of operation of a processor based on a determined anticipated mode of operation

of the processor, as recited in the claims. It is respectfully submitted that Kouropoulus discloses, at col. 2, lines 9 – 11, ascertaining a current mode of operation (whether the monitor is in a sleep mode or turned off). Then, in response to the sensed current mode of operation, Kouropoulus discloses performing an operation that effects the future operation (disconnecting the computer from its modem). In other words, Kouropoulos discloses taking an action that is based on a sensed current mode, and not an action that is based on a determined anticipated mode of operation. An analogous operation in Kouropoulus that may slightly correspond to "modifying the operating voltage provided to the processor based on the anticipated change in the mode of operation of the processor" would be for Kouropoulus to turn off the computer presently if it determines that the computer is going to be disconnected from its modem. However this flow of operations is not shown or suggested in Kouropoulus. Moreover, such a feature would make no sense whatsoever in the context of disconnecting a computer from a modem because such a flow would entail first turning off the computer in anticipation of the upcoming disconnection even though the computer may still be operational through its current modem connection. Conceivably, this would result in an undesirable discontinuity of operation. It is respectfully submitted that neither Takasaki nor Crouch make up for the lack of teaching in Kouropoulus.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 28 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 32-33 and 61-64 depend on claim 28 and therefore they are allowable for at least the reasons claim 28 is allowable.

Claim 55 is directed to an apparatus comprising a power management controller to provide an operating voltage to a processor configured to process wireless communication signals, wherein the power management controller is adapted to determine an anticipated mode of operation of the processor and to modify the operating voltage based on the anticipated mode of operation. For at least the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 55 is allowable.

Claim 58 is directed to an article of manufacture comprising a storage medium, and a set of instructions stored in the storage medium, which when executed by a

power management controller cause the power management controller to perform operations comprising providing an operating voltage to a processor configured to process wireless communication signals, determining an anticipated change in the mode of operation of the processor, and modifying the operating voltage provided to the processor based on the anticipated change in the mode of operation of the processor. For at least the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 58 is allowable. Claims 59 and 60 depend on claim 58 and therefore they are allowable for at least the reasons claim 58 is allowable.

Conclusion

For these reasons, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2084. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: June 24, 2008

/Kevin T. LeMond/
Kevin T. LeMond
Reg. No. 35,933

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-998

Attorney Docket No. MP1508-151677
Application No. 10/811,864